

REMARKS

Claims 8-10 and 14-16 remain pending. By this Amendment, Applicants amend claim 14 to correct an informality. No new matter is added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims at least in light of the following remarks.

I. The Office Action Should NOT be a Final Rejection

The Office Action Summary included with the Office Action indicates that the Office Action is final. However, there is no language in the Office Action itself indicating that the Office Action is final or explaining why the Office Action should be final. As explained in Applicants' September 13, 2011 Amendment, the first Office Action was erroneously directed to claims that were not even pending at the time the Office Action was issued. Thus, the present Office Action is the first Office Action that properly considers the pending claims. Because this is the first Office Action considering the pending claims, the Office Action cannot be final. *See* 36 C.F.R. §1.113 and MPEP §706.07. Thus, the present Office Action must be treated as a non-final Office Action.

II. Acknowledgment of Priority

The Office Action Summary included with the Office Action acknowledges Applicants' claim for priority under §119 by checking box 13(a) on the Office Action Summary. However, the Office Action Summary fails to indicate how the certified copies of the priority documents were received. Applicants respectfully request that box 13(a)(3) be checked in Office Action Summary accompanying the next action to indicate that Applicants' foreign priority application was received from the International Bureau.

III. 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-7 and 9-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0046402 (Ooi) in view of JP-A-2002-078033 (Kobayashi) and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0122565 (Sakurai). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Ooi, Kobayashi, and Sakurai, either alone or in combination fail to disclose a navigation module that (1) determines whether the wake-up mode is due to the ignition signal or due to the activation signal, and (2) acquires its own IP address when it is determined that the wake-up mode is due to the activation signal, generates a mail that contains this acquired

IP address, and sends this mail to the external terminal that sent the activation signal by using the mail address of the external terminal, as recited in claims 8 and 14.

In the "Response to Arguments" section, the Office Action alleges that this feature is disclosed by paragraphs [0104], [0109], and [0115] - [0117] of Ooi, which describe Ooi's "invitation to chat" feature. In Ooi, the user of computer 1-1 selects a computer 1-2 with which to chat and sends that computer 1-2 an email with IP address information. *See* paragraphs [0094] - [0113] and FIGS. 8 and 10. If the user of the computer 1-2 accepts the request by opening the file attached to the email, the computer 1-2 will connect with the computer 1-1. *See* paragraphs [0115] - [0118] and FIGS. 10 and 11. Importantly, in Ooi, the computer 1-1 selects the computer 1-2 to which it sends the email including IP address information based on an input from the user of computer 1-1 selecting a computer with which to chat. In Ooi, no activation signal is sent from the computer 1-2 to computer 1-1 that triggers the sending of the email with the IP address information. Thus, Ooi fails to disclose sending IP address information to an "external terminal that sent the activation signal," as required by claims 8 and 14.

Kobayashi fails to make up for this deficiency of Ooi.

Sakurai also fails to make up for this deficiency of Ooi. Sakurai discloses a "keyless entry wake-up" in which a wake-up signal from the electronic control unit for keyless entry causes a system activation that energizes the sensor, fuel pump, cold start device, etc. *See* paragraph [0065], and step S3 of FIG. 8. However, Sakurai fails to disclose sending any information back to the electronic control unit for keyless entry in response to the signal. Thus, Sakurai also fails to disclose sending IP address information to an "external terminal that sent the activation signal," as required by claims 8 and 14.

Thus, claims 8 and 14 are patentable over Ooi, Kobayashi, and Sakurai. Further, claims 9, 10, 15, and 16 are patentable for at least the same reasons, as well as for the additional features they recite. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

* * *

In view of at least the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Applicants earnestly solicit favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Jesse O. Collier
Registration No. 53,839

JAO:JOC/hs

Date: March 27, 2012

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry of this filing;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461